REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending. Of these, claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24 and 26 are written in independent format.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication (on page 2 of the Office Action) that claims 2-7, 10, 10, 16-21 and 25-27 define allowable subject matter but for their respective dependencies upon a rejected base claim. It is noted that this reply has rewritten allowable claims 5, 19 and 26 into independent format.

§ 102 REJECTION

Beginning on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 8-9, 11, 13-15, 22-24 and 28-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,717,468 ("the '468 patent") to Jeong et al. This rejection is traversed.

The '468 patent is directed to an amplifier circuit (FIG. 4) for a liquid crystal display (LCD) device. In FIG. 4, an output node OUT of the amplifier circuit is selectively driven by a PMOS output transistor MO12 or an NMOS output transistor MO11 according to signals on the gates thereof selectively transferred via PMOS transistor MO4 and NMOS transistor MO7, respectively. To increase a slew rate of the amplifier circuit, the '468 patent teaches that a capacitor C_{PRE} is connected between the gates of output transistors MO12 and MO11. Timing is controlled so that transistors MO4 and MO7 also act to pre-charge capacitor C_{PRE}.

In operation, pre-charged capacitor C_{PRE} of the '468 patent maintains a reference voltage gap between the gates of output transistors MO12 and MO11. This permits the non-selected one of output transistors MO12 and MO11 to drive a small amount of current. In other words, the non-selected one of output transistors MO12 and MO11 never completely turns off, hence a lesser amount of turn-on delay is experienced when the non-selected one of output transistors MO12 and MO11 changes state, i.e., becomes the selected one. See column 6, lines 22-34. Given that the non-selected transistor never

Application No. 10/658,770 Attorney Docket No. 2557-000108/US

completely turns off, a combined operative duration of the output transistors MO12 and MO11 is greater

than an operative duration of the input stage 410 of the an amplifier circuit.

A distinction over the '468 patent of claim 1 (for example) is that a combined operative duration

of the pull-up and pull-down transistors is significantly shorter than an operative duration of the

operational amplifier. As explained above, the converse is true of the '468 patent.

Independent claims 15 and 24 recite a feature similar to claim 1, respectively, and thus at least

similarly distinguish over the '487 patent. Claims 2-4, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 22-23 and 28-29 depend from

claims 1, 15 and 24, respectively, and thus at least similarly distinguish over the '487 patent.

As the '487 patent fails to teach at least one element of each rejected claim, the anticipation

rejection based thereon is improper.

In view of the foregoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

<re>ainder of page intentionally left blank></re>

10

Application No. 10/658,770 Attorney Docket No. 2557-000108/US

CONCLUSION

The issues raised in the Office Action are considered to be resolved. Accordingly, Applicant again requests a Notice of Allowance.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any underpayment or non-payment of any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, or credit any overpayment of such fees, to Deposit Account No. 08-0750, including, in particular, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY\& PIERCE, P.L.C.

By:

Thomas S. Auchterlonie, Reg. No. 37,275

P.O. Box 8910 Reston, VA 20195 (703) 668-8000

TSA/cm:tsa